

Atty. Dkt. No. 03CR135/KE

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the reasons that follow. A detailed listing of all claims that are in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier. Claims 1-37 remain pending in this application.

In the Detailed Action section of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Application No. 5,237,391 to Huggins (hereinafter Huggins). The Examiner has not referred to any figure or text of Huggins in support of this rejection. Applicants request that the Examiner refer to the particular part relied on to show how the elements of the present invention are taught or suggested by Huggins. Applicants further respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 recites "a plurality of secondary optical paths coupled to a primary optical path." Huggins does not teach or suggest any coupling between a plurality of secondary optical paths and a primary optical path.

Claim 1 further recites "an encoding system configured to convert a position signal representative of the physical position of the mechanical device into an encoded signal in a binary format," and that "each of the primary optical path and the secondary optical paths positioned between a light source and the encoding system." Huggins does not teach or suggest optical paths positioned between a light source and an encoding system. An encoder is not an encoding system configured to convert a position signal into an encoded signal in a binary format.

Claim 1 yet further recites that "the encoded signal comprises a plurality of pulses of light each sequentially delayed by the secondary optical paths." Huggins also does not teach or suggest a plurality of pulses of light. Huggins further does not show how the pulse of light are each sequentially delayed by the secondary optical paths.

Atty. Dkt. No. 03CR135/KE

Accordingly, each and every element of claim 1 is not shown or taught by Huggins for at least these reasons. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-18 depend from claim 1 and include all of the limitations thereof. These claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-18 is respectfully requested.

Also in the Detailed Action section of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 19-25 and 31-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Huggins in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,967,071 to Park et al. (hereinafter Park et al.). The Examiner stated that "The patent to Huggins discloses all features of the claimed invention except for the use of the device on an aircraft sensing system." Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 19 recites "means for delaying the incident pulses of light and for delaying the reflected pulses of light." Huggins does not teach or suggest delaying pulses of light. The deficiency of Huggins is not cured by Park et al. Accordingly, each and every element of claim 19 is not taught or suggested by Huggins and Park et al., either alone or in combination. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 is respectfully requested.

Claims 20-25 depend from claim 19 and include all of the limitations thereof. These claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 19. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 20-25 is respectfully requested.

Claim 31 recites "a plurality of fiber optic cables each having a second diameter less than the first diameter and configured for coupling to an end of the single fiber optic cable." Huggins does not teach or suggest coupling a plurality of fiber optic cables to an end of the single fiber optic cable. The deficiency of Huggins is not cured by Park et al. Accordingly, each and every element of claim 31 is not taught or suggested by Huggins and Park et al., either alone or in

Atty. Dkt. No. 03CR135/KE

combination. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 31 is respectfully requested.

Claims 32-37 depend from claim 31 and include all of the limitations thereof. These claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 31. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 32-37 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner indicated that claims 26-30 are allowable. Applicants thank the Examiner for consideration and allowance of these claims.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Atty. Dkt. No. 03CR135/KE

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 18-1722.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 21, 2008

ROCKWELL COLLINS, INC.  
400 Collins Road, NE  
M/S 124-323  
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498  
Telephone: (319) 295-8280  
Facsimile: (319) 295-8777  
Customer No. 26383

By Kyle Eppelle  
Kyle Eppelle  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 34,155